

THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE OF THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10TH, 2013; 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL DAYLIGHT TIME (CDT) REMAINS UNCHANGED

All Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by inserting Amendment Number 05 and date in Block 14 of the original SF 33 with your proposal submission. **Note:** Since there are only 4 blocks for amendment acknowledgement on the form itself, GSA will accept it if you just type/write "Amendments 01 thru 05" and date it the date of this last amendment 05 "September 12" in only one of the blocks.

This Amendment 05 addresses questions received in response to the solicitation. The purpose of this Amendment is to answer questions from prospective Offerors and to correct a mathematical error the Self Scoring Worksheet in Section J.5.1.

1. **Question:** Confirm or correct - Offerors that have already prepared submissions need *not* use the Amendment forms (SF33, SF1408, etc.) as long as the signed-and-submitted forms contain the necessary information (e.g. acknowledgement of amendments).

Response: As of the date of this Amendment 05 for OASIS SB: Offerors must submit the following attachments:

SF 33 – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 04**.

Section K – Offerors may use the electronic format in Amendment 04 or print it out and manually fill it out and scan it in PDF format. If you use the electronic form in Word, please save it as a PDF file when you submit.

Section J.3. – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 04** in the header.

Section J.4. – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 04** in the header

Section J.5.1. – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 05** in the header

Section J.6. – Offerors can use any Section J.6.Template from **the original solicitation through the final amendment**.

Amendment 03 only removed the requirement to attach audits directly to the form itself and Amendment 04 only fixed formatting issues when typing in explanations. No other changes were made.

Section J.7. – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 04** in the header

Section J.8. – If already filled out from a Customer, GSA will accept any Past Performance Survey **from the original solicitation through the final amendments, however**, Amendment 03 removed item #6 from Past Performance altogether for OASIS SB. If you have past performance surveys on OASIS SB that were completed prior to Amendment 03 with item #6 scored, you do not have to redo them, however, item #6 will not be used (i.e., neutral score) for determining your overall past performance score.

Section J.9. – Offerors can use any Cost/Prime Template **from the original solicitation through the final amendment** since no changes have been made to the Cost/Price Template.

Section J.10. – Offerors must use the attachment with **Amendment 04** in the header.

2. **Question:** To be considered compliant, will the government accept a Past Performance Rating Form submitted directly to GSA if we submit a letter with our proposal from the agency documenting their policy that states they cannot send such information to contractors?

Response: Please have any Government agency contact the OASIS Program Office with regards to submitting Past Performance information. We will attempt to convince them to follow the prescribed process. In the event that the agency or individual insists on sending the information directly to the Government, we will receive the ratings and then forward them to the Offeror for inclusion in proposals and completion of self-scoring. Offerors are to clearly understand, however, that this is a last resort effort and that the OASIS Program Office assumes ZERO responsibility for ensuring delivery of this sort of information. We will make a best faith effort to forward information within 24 hours of receipt, but in the event there is a delay, an email problem, a glitch, or mistake, GSA will not provide any form of consideration to the affected Offeror.

3. **Question:** If our customer submits a past performance survey directly to GSA to whom should they direct it to ensure it is recognized as part of our proposal?

Response: All information should be sent to (and only to) oasis@gsa.gov.

4. **Question:** On the self-scoring worksheet in Section L.5.3.2.2 Individual Project Value there is an error in the math formula for the addition of the points.

Response: We corrected this error and realigned Column A of the Self Scoring Worksheet Section J.5.1. (5A) and Sample Worksheet in Section J.5.2. (5B). **You must use the corrected Section J.5.1. (5A) attachment (Amendment 05) with your proposal submission.**

5. **Question:** As part of Amendment 4, the Section L (L.5.3.1, page 109) text was updated to include: "A MINIMUM OF THREE (3) UP TO A MAXIMUM OF FIVE (5) distinct Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects (each as a Prime Contractor or existing CTA in accordance with the definitions in Sections L.5.1.9. and L.5.1.10) that meet the following minimum conditions:" Prior indications were that two (2) prime contracts within the past five year was the minimum, as long as both were within the same pool and for qualifications within that pool. Can you confirm that the new requirement is for at least three (3) prime contracts within the past 5 years?

Response: The previous requirement for Section L.5.3.1 was for a minimum of 5 projects. These are relevant experience projects and these are the projects that will be scored. We have lowered the minimum to 3 projects, but will score up to 5. The 2 project requirement you are talking about is for Pool Qualification, which is in Section L.5.1.2. Those projects may be the same projects as the relevant experience projects or they may be different projects. These projects are not scored and are not subject to the same minimum requirements that apply to relevant experience projects.

6. **Question:** Per the new amendment, attachment J.5.1 shows the minimum past performance project amount beginning at \$750,000 while the J.7 primary performance attachment shows the minimum project amount of \$150,000. Can you please clarify this inconsistency?

Response: There is no inconsistency. J.5.1 is a self-scoring worksheet. Points are given to projects starting at the \$750K/year level. The minimum value is \$150K/year, but we only give points for things above and beyond the minimum requirements.

7. **Clarification:** GSA's current naming convention does not allow us to distinguish between the multitude of different files that are required for each Primary project. In some cases, there are over 15 files needed to substantiate the different aspects of a single project (i.e., Period of Performance, NAICS, disciplines, annual value, multiple locations, subcontractors, etc).

Response: As stated previously, some contract documents are all inclusive and some are not. There are too many combinations and scenarios to foresee or account for every possible situation for every individual Offeror. Please note that the Table is a guideline to assist Offerors and that the primary goal is to ensure the government can easily identify which documents apply to which criteria for evaluation purposes. The Offerors are allowed their own Table of Contents to assist with this matter.

8. **Question:** Section L.5.4, Past Performance, can GSA please specify what CPARS reports are required for submission for a collection of task orders. Should we submit the master level IDIQ CPARS only? Or Should we submit the master level IDIQ CPARS and all task order CPARS because the periods of performance associated with the Task Orders do not exactly align with the performance review period covered under the master level IDIQ CPARS? Or Should we submit the master level IDIQ CPARS for task order 1,3,and 5 because their periods of performance either start or end within the master level IDIQ's CPAR performance review period and the only CPARS for TO's 2, 4, and 6 above since their periods of performance fall outside of the master level IDIQ's CPAR performance review period? Or Should we just submit the task order CPARS only and not the master level IDIQ CPARS?

Response: If you have CPARS reports for each individual task order, then the CPARS report for the IDIQ does not likely cover task order performance, so only send the CPARS reports from each individual task order. If you have a CPARS report

for the IDIQ that does cover each individual task order (i.e., there is no CPARS done at the task order level), then submit the CPARS report for the IDIQ.

9. **Question:** We have a primary experience project that is set to end on September 30, 2013. Are we correct in our interpretation that for the purposes of calculating the pass/fail requirement for annual dollar value on this project that we would treat this as an ongoing project (because it would be ongoing as of September 17, 2013) and calculate the annual dollar value by taking the total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods) divided by the total number of months of performance (inclusive of all option periods) multiplied by 12?

Response: Because the project would be complete as of the proposal due date, the project value would be determined based on obligated dollars and not estimated value. We are allowing consideration for Sept 17 as it affects timeline eligibility but the Sept 17 date does not affect project value. If the project is complete, use the actual obligated dollars. If the project is ongoing, use the total estimated value.

10. **Question:** Due to the extension date this has created a situation where one of our past performances is now over the required time limit. Our customer has already completed the survey. Would GSA allow past performance from companies to still be valid as on the original closing date of 17 Sep?

Response: Yes. Some sections do state 5 years from the proposal due date; however, to be exact we are allowing projects that meet the 5 year limitation of ongoing or completed between **September 16, 2008 through October 9, 2013** to be as flexible and as inclusive as we can.

11. **Question:** Attachment J.4, page 12, question #6: Does your offer include a separate and completed Relevant Experience (Secondary) Project template (Attachment J.10.)? (Required for all Offerors)

Response: You must fill out attachment J.10 and submit it with your proposal even if you are not taking credit for the additional points for Mission Spaces or Multiple Award Contracts/Task Orders. That attachment allows you to select N/A for Multiple Award Contracts/Task Orders. This just makes it easier for us to track.

12. **Question:** We have a Single-Award IDIQ/BPA with a POP of 10 years and a value >\$30M. Under the contract, we have a single task order project that demonstrates experience in all 6 core disciplines. The single task order project has a value of >\$2M and a POP of 1 year. May we assume that if we submit this one task order project, the value will be based on \$2M divided by the 1-year POP rather than the \$2M divided by the 10-year POP of the IDIQ contract?

Response: If you are using that single task order, that is correct

13. **Question:** Are efforts requiring security clearances for the “predominant task order scope of work” considered ancillary and out of scope? Please confirm and/or clarify.

Response: Absolutely not. Task orders may require security clearances. Because there are different standards for security clearances across Government, we chose not to include them for ceiling rate determination, but security clearances are not considered ancillary and have no bearing on scope.

14. **Question:** May government customers be able to use OASIS for work that requires personnel to possess a Secret clearance, at a minimum?

Response: Absolutely. Task order requirements may specify any security requirements applicable to the individual task order. This includes Secret, Top Secret, Top Secret SCI, etc, as well as any other alternative security classification system applicable to various agencies.

15. **Reference previous Question:** L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, paragraph 1: If a Single-Award IDIQ Task Order has 20 TOs, can an offeror submit TO1 as one of the 5 relevant experience projects, and TOs 2-4 (as a collection of Task Orders) as a separate project under the 5 relevant experience projects?

Previous Response: No. If a single-award IDIQ contract is being used as a Relevant Experience example, ALL task orders under that contract belong to that single Relevant Experience project.

Clarification: After reading through the last amendment, there does not appear to be any language in the RFP that prohibits this scenario. Can the Government confirm that the previous response still applies? If so, why is this restriction not outlined in the solicitation? In this scenario each TO dollar value would contribute only to that projects value, and not be counted twice.

Response: The response still applies. Either use the entire IDIQ or use the task orders individually. Q&As are part of each amendment and are binding. We simply cannot place every caveat and nuance of every issue in the solicitation document.

16. **Question:** L.5.5.2 Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates: Will the Government allow an Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) which has been submitted to DCAA and is applicable during the award period to be submitted in lieu of an FPRA, or FPRR?

Response: Yes.

17. **Question:** L.6.2 Indirect Rates/Profit: Will the Government accept an offeror's Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) as verification of their proposed indirect rates, which were derived using an approved accounting system? This approach is consistent with the offeror's disclosed accounting practices and has been accepted by other Government agencies as a form of verifying their proposed indirect rates.

Response: Yes.

18. **Question:** Section L Table, Volume 6: Will the Government allow offeror's to submit support documentation to substantiate indirect rates submitted? If so will the government add file name requirements to the table?

Response: Yes. Offerors may create file names for this purpose if necessary. Please use the same general methodology as suggested in Section L.4.

19. **Question:** Section I: Can 52.227-3 be removed? Since Clauses 52.227-1 Authorization to Consent, 52.227-2 Notice and Assistance Regarding Patent and Copyright Infringement are already included; there is no need for 52.227-3 Patent Indemnity are in the Request for Proposal since that would be between the Government and a subcontractor.

Response: The clauses identified in Section I.2 apply at the contract level only. Only Required and Applicable clauses (in accordance with the clause matrix) flow down to the task order level. Please see section I.1.

20. **Question:** Section I: Why is FAR Clause 52.203-16 included in the RFP? It should be removed from the RFP because Section C.4 (page) 23 "Services Not in Scope" states that task orders should not come out that involve Inherently Government Functions. If, however, the Government believes there is the possibility that certain individual task orders might include certain minimal functions such as this, we would recommend the Government consider adding 52.203-16 on a task order by task order basis (similar to how the Davis Bacon Act is addressed in Section B.3.2), rather than including it in the umbrella contract and, thereby, adding significant administrative costs that might not actually be necessary for most contractors (since most contractors would not be performing any of this kind of work).

Response: The clauses identified in Section I.2 apply at the contract level only. Only Required and Applicable clauses (in accordance with the clause matrix) flow down to the task order level. Please see section I.1.

21. **Question:** Section L.4. Proposal Format, Page 87, Paragraph 6 Proposal Format Table:
The above referenced paragraph indicates that the inclusion of a Table of Contents is optional. Would the Government also allow the Offerors to optionally include a cover page, inside cover page, and section pages for each volume?

Response: No. Please do not provide cover pages.

22. **Question:** Section L.5.3.1. Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, Page 109, Paragraph 2; and Section J.7., Attachment (7), Page 30, Relevant Experience Project 5 Alternate:
The above referenced paragraph states, "One (1) of the required relevant experience primary projects may, at the discretion of the Offeror, be a collection of task orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract or Single-Award BPA." Would the Government consider allowing Offerors to use a collection of task orders placed under a Multiple Award BPA?

Response: No.

23. **Question:** Section L.5.3.3.1. Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Mission Spaces, Page 114, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 2.; Section L.5.3.3.2. Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders, Page 116, Subparagraph 4. (the second Subparagraph 3.); and Section J.10., Attachment (10), Page 1, General Instructions:

The above referenced subparagraphs seem to indicate that if an Offeror uses any of the "Primary", "Pool Qualification", or in the case of the latter referenced subparagraph, "Secondary with Mission Spaces" projects as Relevant Experience (Secondary) Project entries, the Offeror will need to re-submit the project(s).

Due to the fact that Section J.10., Attachment (10) Relevant Experience (Secondary) Project Template is formatted differently than Section J.7., Attachment (7) Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template, we are confused as to how the information supplied in Attachment 7 can be re-submitted using the Attachment 10 template. The General Instructions listed in Attachment 10 provide no further clarification.

As the requirements for the information to be provided for the Primary, Pool Qualification, and Secondary with Mission Spaces projects vary, and further instructions are not adequately provided in the Attachment 10 template, we are confused as to what information should be provided in each circumstance. Would the Government clarify what exactly would be required for the re-submission of Primary, Pool Qualification, and Secondary with Mission Spaces projects in accordance with the terms of Section L.5.3.3. Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects and the Offeror's use of Attachment 10?

Response: Whatever documentation you provided to validate the award in one section, rename the file accordingly and include it again in the other required section(s). For example, if Relevant Experience (Primary) Project 1 is a contract for the US Navy under NAICS code 541330, then the award document could be provided as file ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.pdf for Pool Qualification, file ABC.VOL1.PQ.CODE.P1.P1.pdf for NAICS code validation, file ABC.VOL3.REPP.CD.P1.pdf for Relevant Experience, file ABC.VOL3.REPP.CODE.P1.pdf for Relevant Experience NAICS, etc. We can't make assumptions about what documentation you want us to use for various elements of the proposal. Table L.4. provides a suggested naming methodology for both Primary and Secondary projects.